

I respectfully request that my colleagues join me in saluting Albert R. Gunther and recognizing his contributions to generations of young people, and toward the betterment of our community.

DEDICATION OF TEMPLE ISRAEL

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1995

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the dedication of a new synagogue building for Temple Israel of Dayton, OH, within my district. The building is an important milestone for the Dayton Jewish community.

Temple Israel traces its roots to 1850, when 12 Jews in Dayton formed a Hebrew Society. The congregation, which was incorporated as Kehillah Kodesh B'nai Yeshurun, bought a building in 1863. In 1893, the congregation had grown enough to construct a new synagogue at the corner of First and Jefferson Streets in downtown.

Downtown was severely damaged by the great Dayton flood of 1913. By 1925, the congregation began construction of a new building at the corner of Salem and Emerson Avenues, in the neighborhood of Dayton View. This building was expanded in 1953 with the addition of a new sanctuary.

In November 1994, the congregation moved into its new home at One Riverbend, on the west bank of the Great Miami River, just north of downtown. On Friday, May 5, the building was formerly dedicated at a service. The following Sunday, Temple Israel opened its building and grounds to the Dayton community at an open house.

I offer my congratulations to Temple Israel's Rabbi P. Irving Bloom, whose vision and leadership have led to this moment. I further extend my best wishes to the entire congregation to find fulfillment in using the building for generations to come.

THREATS TO CUT USIA THREATEN AMERICAN SECURITY

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1995

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, next week the International Relations Committee will mark up legislation that threatens major changes in America's foreign policy institutions. This legislation—that appears to be largely driven by pledges from Senator HELMS to consolidate America's foreign policy instruments—was just received this morning by Congressman HAMILTON and has not yet been reviewed by most Democrats, nor, I venture to say, by many Republicans. Yet, the committee appears to be determined to move its legislation forward.

Through press statements, we have learned that Senator HELMS' agenda is to eliminate the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [ACDA], the Agency for International Development [AID], and the U.S. Information Agency [USIA]. The functions of these agencies are to be combined into a mega-bureaucracy in the

Department of State. Senator HELMS claims major savings in this reform although he acknowledges that few actual savings will be realized in the first 2 years of his proposed consolidation.

I believe that there is even a greater cost to this proposal. It is in the cost to our national security. In this day of increasing threats from terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, now is not the time to dismantle the first line of America's defense: our foreign policy institutions which served this country so well in the cold war.

We all believe that in this post-cold-war era, when threats to American citizens and our nation can come equally from the actions of a lone terrorist or another country, when threats can be economic as well as military, we do need to reexamine our Nation's foreign policy bureaucracy in order to make it more efficient. But this effort is already underway through Vice President GORE's National Policy Review and Secretary of State Christopher's internal strategic management initiative.

We need a reasoned, rational approach to reform that matches objective with means in a manner that protects and advances American national security. Legislation designed by political impulse and railroad through the political process without time for full regard to cost or benefit is dangerous tinkering with America's security.

I am not alone in my desire for hesitation or in my concern for the result. A bipartisan group from Freedom House recently released a statement opposing the elimination of USIA. This group, which includes among others former U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, Edward Fuelner, Jr., president of the Heritage Foundation, former Senator Malcolm Wallop, and Emmett Tyrrell, Jr., editor of the American Spectator, cogently and persuasively argues that "this proposed consolidation and centralization would weaken American public diplomacy."

The arguments that they make on behalf of preserving one agency, USIA, I believe can be made, and will be made next week, on behalf of the other agencies now threatened by the proposed legislation. Weakening the independent voices and undermining the effectiveness of ACDA and USAID will not strengthen American foreign policy. I encourage my colleagues to read closely the statement issued by Freedom House and review carefully the legislation once it is introduced by the Republicans.

I ask that the Freedom House report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

THE FUTURE OF U.S. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

New proposals have been advanced to place the United States Information Agency (USIA)—long the chief instrument of American public diplomacy—under the centralized control of the State Department. We believe this proposed consolidation and centralization would weaken American public diplomacy.

Why should the USIA remain independent? Through its broadcasting, numerous exchange programs and links with people throughout the world, it already is highly successful in promoting American interests and articulating who we are and how our policies and values are shaped. The State Department has a different though related role. It explains U.S. foreign policy to Americans and presents our government's official positions to foreign governments. The State Department values quiet negotiations, govern-

ment-to-government contacts, protracted discussion, compromise and sometimes secrecy. A credible public diplomacy, by contrast, requires openness, the ability to respond quickly to rapidly changing world events, and independence in reporting, analysis and comment. In short, the culture of the State Department differs substantially from the culture of the USIA.

There are other important reasons to retain the USIA's present status.

Public diplomacy and formal diplomacy. While formal diplomatic relations conducted by the State Department are an important aspect of our government's diverse engagement with other societies, public diplomacy—our open efforts to win understanding and support among the peoples of foreign countries on matters that affect U.S. national interests—suffers when it is subordinated to the demands of formal diplomacy. We have long-term interests in developing flexible relationships with foreign educators, journalists, cultural leaders, minority and opposition leaders that must not be subjected to the daily pressures of official government-to-government affairs. USIA has filled this niche by setting up exchanges that introduce foreign representatives to U.S. governmental, non-governmental, private, business and cultural institutions.

American values: independent voices, one theme. The promotion of American political and economic values has been an auspicious aspect of our foreign policy in recent times. The spread of democracy and the global communication revolution indicate that this form of engagement in foreign affairs will be of great importance in the future. Diversification and independence—not centralization and uniformity—make the U.S.'s message more meaningful and credible. The USIA's broadcasting and exchange programs should remain free of interference from officials with responsibilities in other areas. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Voice of America and Radio Marti remain vital sources of information around the world. In East-Central Europe and the former Soviet Union (where independent media continue to face difficulties) RFE/RL is trusted precisely because of its journalistic integrity. This would be seriously compromised if they were perceived as official organs of State Department policy.

Re-orientation before re-organization. The structure of our foreign affairs agencies needs to be considered in light of America's global strategy in a rapidly changing international environment. Re-organization not rooted in a clear and comprehensive understanding and consensus about goals and missions cannot work or last. The USIA and federally-funded international broadcasting have track records of success and will continue to work. Indeed, with today's menacing phenomena of international criminal activity, terrorism, inter-ethnic hatreds and anti-democratic forces around the world, the work of USIA is more critical than ever.

We understand that there will have to be some significant re-organization and reprioritization in foreign policy. Those who have offered proposals for change have done some service. The world has changed, in no small measure because of our multi-layered and multi-faceted foreign policy structures. Our goal should be coordination between agencies, not the kind of consolidated administrative centralism that will not work. The tasks of the State Department and the public diplomacy agencies should nurture one another, but must remain separate to be truly effective.